DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 104 TM 021 827

AUTHOR Kochan, Susan E.; And Others
TITLE Improving Louisiana's School Report Cards with Input from Parents and School Staff.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Achievement Rating; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Dissemination; Parent Attitudes; *Parents; *Profiles; *Report Cards; School Districts; School Statistics; State Programs; Teacher Attitudes; *Teachers; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS Focus Groups Approach; *Louisiana

ABSTRACT

Louisiana is one of the few states that uses indicator data to produce school report cards for statewide distribution to parents. The system, the Progress Profiles Program, produces report cards that must be accessible, meaningful, and understandable to a lay audience. An evaluation of the 1991-92 report cards was undertaken in 1993. In Phase 1 approximately 2,000 parents and 6,000 faculty members were asked about the readability and utility of report card information. Responses from 291 parents found them generally positive about the report cards, but doubtful that they would have real impact. The 2,139 teachers were less uniformly positive than were the parents, and more than 40 percent thought that publishing report cards would not help improve the quality of education. Teachers found the report cards less informative than did parents. Revisions based on opinions from four focus groups include individualized formats for elementary, secondary, and K-12 schools, with additional explanatory text, better design, more information about indicators, and revision to an eighth-grade text level. Four exhibits present study findings. Attachments present high school and all-grade school report cards. (Contains 4 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 104

Improving Louisiana's School Report Cards With Input From Parents and School Staff

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SUSAN KOCHAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Susan E. Kochan
Dr. Bobby J. Franklin
Dr. Linda J. Crone
Catherine H. Glascock

Louisiana Department of Education

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, Louisiana

April 4-9, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM021827

INTRODUCTION

The publication in 1983 of *A Nation at Risk* prompted a flurry of education reform activity as states nationwide sought to create or expand education performance monitoring systems. Though school-level indicator systems have since become commonplace around the nation, Louisiana remains one of a very few states that use indicator data to produce "school report cards" for statewide distribution to parents.

Louisiana's school indicator system, the Progress Profiles Program, is mandated by the 1988 Children First Act and administered by the Louisiana Department of Education (LDE) Bureau of School Accountability. The program's purpose is three-fold: a) to establish a database for educational planning, b) to increase accountability at all levels, and c) to inform the parents of school children and the general public on the condition of education (Children First Act, 1998). To date, four rounds of *Report Cards* have been produced based on data from the 1989-90, 1990-91, 1991-92 school years, and 1992-93 school years.

Because a primary purpose of the Profiles program is to provide parents and the general public with school-level information on the condition of education, its effectiveness is measurable to some extent by the degree to which "report card" data are accessible, meaningful, and understandable to a lay audience. Though informal feedback related to those issues was solicited after distribution of the first two *Report Cards*, the first LDE chose to undertake a more comprehensive evaluation of the 1991-92 *Report Cards*. A third-party evaluation was ruled out due to time and funding constraints, compelling the Bureau of School Accountability to launch its own internal evaluation. The resulting study addressed five research questions *(See Exhibit 1)*, employed a mixed-methods design (i.e., it combined quantitative and qualitative methods), and was conducted in two phases.

In Phase I, a random sample of parents and school faculty statewide were surveyed my mail using a 30-item questionnaire that rated the readability and utility of information presented in the *Report Cards*. Four focus groups (two with parents, two with teachers) were conducted in Phase II, following up and enlarging upon findings from Phase I.

PHASE I: SURVEY

Research Design

Sample. For the purposes of Phase I, staff from the Bureau of School Accountability drew a 10% stratified random sample of schools from among the 1,388 public elementary and secondary schools that received *1991-92 Report Cards*.[1] Local education authorities (LEAs) were then asked to draw a 10% random sample of children attending the targeted schools and to provide demographic information and mailing labels for those students. Those systems that could not select a random sample of students were asked to provide demographic and mailing information on all students attending the targeted schools so that LDE staff could make the random selection. All but one district complied with the request, yielding a final sample of 135 schools and roughly 2,000

[1] To ensure that the sample was representative of the population of *Report Card* schools, the sample was stratified by school type (i.e., grade configuration), student body SES, and urbanicity.

EXHIBIT I

Research Questions: *School Report Card Study*

	Research Questions
1.	To what degree are public school parents aware of the Progress Profiles (*School Report Cards)* Program?
2.	What attitudes do public school parents and faculty (teachers/principals) express toward the Progress Profiles (*School Report Cards)* Program?
3.	How well do public school parents and faculty understand the information presented on the *1991-92 School Report Cards*?
4.	How well do the *1991-92 School Report Cards* convey the type(s) of information that public school parents and faculty want to know about schools?
5.	Do parental and faculty attitudes, awareness, and understanding differ based on demographic characteristics of the audience (i.e., gender, race, ethnicity, income, or level of education)?

parents. All teachers and principals at the sample schools also were surveyed, for a total of roughly 6,000 faculty.

Instrumentation. The *1991-92 School Report Cards* were distributed statewide in April 1993. Approximately 30 days later, each parent in the sample was mailed a survey form and a *1991-92 School Report Card (See Appendix)* for his/her child's school. The questionnaire included 30 closed-ended items, each on a four-point Likert scale. Six items assessed parental attitudes toward the *School Report Card* program. The respondents used the remaining closed-ended items to indicate how readable and informative they found each of the 10 *Report Card* indicators. Respondents were also encouraged to provide open-ended comments. Copies of a parallel questionnaire were simultaneously distributed to principals at the sample schools, with instructions that they and their teaching staff complete and return the surveys to the Bureau of School Accountability.

A total of 291 parent surveys ultimately were returned for a parental response rate of 14.6%. Of the roughly 6,000 teachers and principals surveyed, 2,139 completed forms were returned for a 35.7% response rate. Despite the low parent response rate, minority representation approximated that found among the general statewide population. Respondents also were evenly distributed across income levels; demographic representation ranged from a high of 25% in the $15,000-and-under category to a low of 15% in the $50,000-plus category.

Analysis. Responses to the closed-ended items were analyzed using descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (ANOVA) so that comparisons could be made across subgroups based on race, gender, and respondent type (i.e., parent, teacher, or principal). Open-ended comments were analyzed using the constant comparative technique (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and QUALPRO text database manager.

The constant comparison technique is one approach to content analysis and may be generally described as the division of text into units of meaning and a quantification of these units according to certain rules. The constant comparison technique is a multi-stage process. Initially, text is objectively and systematically subdivided into logical units *(unitized)*, with each unit representing a single identifiable concept. As the researcher moves progressively through the document, each unit of text is coded on the basis of a "looks-alike/feels alike" judgement. The intent is to capture the meaning of the respective units as accurately as possible and to code text consistently whenever an identifiable concept resurfaces. The systematic and consistent coding of text is possible only if researchers *constantly compare* the various units of text and their respective codes. Coding thus becomes an iterative process. In comparing "fresh text" to language that has already been coded, the researcher may detect subtle shades of meaning that were not obvious when the coding first began. As a result, text that was coded one way early in the analysis may be relabeled more precisely later on.

As more and more text is coded, the researcher inevitably develops informal rules for coding some information one way and other information another. Gradually, the emphasis shifts from comparing new units with already coded ones to coding units on the basis of how well they conform with the emerging rules. As the coding progresses, related codes are integrated into broader categories. This *categorization* process compels the researcher to constantly test and refine the categorization rules. In the course of doing so, the relationships among coded units are made more explicit and categories become more coherent. Eventually, the coding and categorization become so exacting and the categories so thoroughly fleshed out that there is nothing to be gained from continued analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Survey Findings

Quantitative Findings. Exhibit II compares parent and teacher responses on the six closed-ended attitudinal items from the *School Report Card* survey. Analysis of all six items showed that parents were generally positive toward the concept of a *School Report Card* program, but were somewhat less optimistic that the program could have a real impact on the quality of education at their child's school. For example, nearly 9 in 10 parent respondents (88.7%) agreed with the statement, "All parents of public school children should receive a *School Report Card* on their child's school." A smaller but still substantial percentage of respondents (82.5%) agreed that "the information in the *School Report Card* helps me better understand the strengths and weaknesses of my child's school."

The farther the focus shifted from their child's specific school, the more pessimistic the respondents apparently became that the *Report Cards* could actually improve education. For example, roughly three out of every four parents (76.6%) felt that the *Report Card* data would help faculty make improvements at their child's school. However, when presented with the more general comment, "Publishing *School Report Cards* like this one will **not** help improve the quality of education," nearly 30% of parent respondents agreed. This pattern of parents expressing greater satisfaction and optimism about their child's school but greater dissatisfaction and pessimism about education in general is consistent with national findings (Elam et al, 1992).

Analysis of teacher responses to the closed-ended items showed a similar pattern of responses, though teachers were uniformly less positive in their responses than parents.

For example, 10% fewer teachers agreed that "all parents of public school children should receive a *School Report Card*," and more than 40% of teachers felt that publishing *Report Cards* would not help to improve the quality of education.

In addition to the six attitudinal items, respondents were asked to rate all 10 *Report Card* indicators on a four-point readability scale (ranging from "Very Difficult to Understand" to "Very Easy to Understand"). The questionnaire also included a four-point utility scale measuring the extent to which each indicator helps "you become more knowledgeable about the strengths and weaknesses of your child's school. As noted in Exhibits III and IV, parents gave all 10 indicators high readability ratings and lower (but nonetheless positive) utility ratings. In every instance but one (i.e., the class size indicator), teachers rated the indicators easier to understand than did parents — a logical phenomenon given their greater familiarity with schools.

Perhaps because of this greater familiarity with school characteristics and outcomes, teachers tended to find the *Report Card* indicators less informative than did parents. As noted in Exhibit IV, utility ratings by parents ranged from a high of 83% for faculty degree to a low of 70.4% for dropouts. Utility ratings by faculty ranged from a high of 79.7% for the faculty degree indicator to a low of 67.7% for the class size indicator. Interestingly, class size was viewed as the second most informative indicator by parents, but the least informative to faculty.

The relative lack of interest in the suspension/expulsion, ACT, and dropout

Exhibit II

Percent of Respondents Who Agreed With Attitudinal Items,
By Respondent Type

Attitudinal Item	Parents	Faculty
The information included in the enclosed *School Report Card* will help the principal and teachers to improve the quality of education at my/my child's school.	76.6%	70.;9%
All parents of public school children should receive a *School Report Card* on their child's school.	88.7%	78.7%
The information included in the *School Report Card* helps me better understand the strengths and weaknesses of my/my child's school.	82.5%	74.2%
Publishing *School Report Cards* like this one will **not** help improve the quality of education.	29.9%	41.0%
Only those parents who request a *School Report Card* should receive one.	25.8%	37.0%
Reports like this one are a waste of time and money.	21.7%	39.5%

EXHIBIT III

Percent of Survey Respondents Who Rated Indicators
Easy/Very Easy to Understand, By Type of Respondent

Indicator	Parents	Faculty
Faculty Degree	88.2% (# 1)	93.1% (# 1)
Attendance	88.2% (# 1)	92.2% (# 2)
Suspended/Expelled	86.7% (# 3)	90.3% (# 6)
School Summary	86.5% (# 4)	92.0% (# 3)
Class Size	86.5% (# 4)	83.6% (#10)
NRT Results	83.6% (# 6)	84.2% (# 9)
Certification	82.6% (# 7)	90.7% (# 4)
ACT Results	82.3% (# 8)	86.6% (# 7)
CRT Results	81.4% (# 9)	84.8% (# 8)
Dropouts	80.4% (#10)	90.6% (#5)

indicators may be partially attributable to the fact that these indicators are strongly influenced by school type (i.e., elementary, secondary). ACT results and dropout rates were reported only for secondary grades, and the *1991-92 Report Cards* for many elementary schools showed zero students suspended/expelled. As a result, these indicators would have offered very little information to elementary parent and teacher respondents.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare participant responses by race, gender, and respondent type (parent, teacher). T-tests were conducted to determine whether differences in subgroup responses were statistically significant. Minorities were significantly more positive in their responses than were whites ($p < .05$), and females gave the indicators consistently higher readability ratings than did males, regardless of the category of respondent (i.e., parent, teacher, or principal). These gender differences were not statistically significant among parents, but were significant among faculty ($p < .05$). Finally, principals were significantly more positive in their attitudes than were teachers.

This latter finding was unexpected, in that a survey of teachers conducted following release of the *1990-91 School Report Cards* showed principals more critical than teachers. In retrospect, however, the differing sampling strategies used for the two surveys may be partially responsible for the different results. Principals who completed *1990-91 Report Card* questionnaires were surveyed at a statewide professional conference; their participation was completely anonymous. The principals who responded to the survey on *1991-92 Report Cards* may have felt much more identifiable by virtue of the

EXHIBIT IV

Percent of Survey Respondents Who Rated Indicators
Helpful/Very Helpful, By Type of Respondent

Indicator	Parents	Faculty
Faculty Degree	83.0% (# 1)	79.7% (# 1)
Class Size	82.6% (# 2)	67.7% (#10)
Certification	81.4% (# 3)	74.8% (# 4)
Attendance	80.6% (# 4)	77.4% (# 2)
CRT Results	79.9% (# 5)	75.9% (# 3)
NRT Results	79.4% (# 6)	75.0% (# 4)
School Summary	75.4% (# 7)	71.7% (# 6)
Suspended/Expelled	73.8% (# 8)	71.7% (# 6)
ACT Results	72.7% (# 9)	71.7% (# 6)
Dropouts	70.4% (#10)	68.1% (#9)

fact that the teaching staff of selected schools were surveyed. Individual teachers would have been one among many faculty respondents at the school. They therefore would have enjoyed greater anonymity than their principal, who might have felt compelled to provide a more socially desirable (positive) response.

The LDE analysis showed statistically significant differences among responses, based on the educational level and SES of respondents. Low-income and/or poorly educated parents (those with less than a high school education) were significantly more positive in their attitudes to the program ($p < .05$), and had more difficulty reading the *Report Card* indicators ($p < .05$).

Qualitative Findings. As previously mentioned, all open-ended comments were analyzed using the constant comparative technique (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The resulting findings yielded further evidence that parents and faculty perceived the *Report Cards* as easy to read. They also suggested that some respondents *who felt they understood* the indicators were in fact *misinterpreting them.* For example, some respondents apparently believed that the certification indicator showed the percent of teachers at a school who were uncertified (i.e., held no teaching certificate whatsoever) when the data in fact showed the percent of teachers at a school who were uncertified *for a particular course.* Also, some parents could not distinguish between the state's criterion- and norm-referenced tests.

Analysis of the open-ended comments also shed further light on the pessimism

expressed by some respondents that the program could not contribute to school improvement. Some of the most negative comments expressed by parents seemed more a reflection of the respondents' unhappiness with their community school or their dissatisfaction with education in general than with the *Report Card* program in specific. "Why are you spending this money on a useless project?" one parent asked. "The curriculum at ... School is obviously designed for underachievers. Why don't you do something about that instead?" Another parent insisted that "You are wasting your money and my time. In 36 years of sending children and grandchildren to Louisiana public schools, this school is the worst over all I've ever saw [SIC]."

The frustration such comments conveyed — that the *Profiles* program is a wasted effort, not because the *Report Card* itself is bad, but because schools are beyond "fixing" — was very explicit in one father's comment. "All parents of public school children should receive a *School Report Card* on their child's school, not that it will do any good," he wrote. The respondent indicated by his attitudinal responses that he believed that *Report Cards* help parents understand the strengths and weaknesses of their child's school, and he also agreed that every parent should receive one. He nonetheless strongly disagreed that the *Report Card* would help the school staff make improvements, and further indicated that publishing *School Report Cards* **would not** help improve the quality of education.

Roughly half of the respondents who provided open-ended comments suggested including additional information on future *Report Cards*. Parents requested more detailed information on student discipline and teacher preparation/certification, while school staff requested more student demographic information, particularly on student body socioeconomic status (SES).

Admittedly open-ended feedback was obtained from only a tiny percentage of the parent sample (i.e., half of all parent respondents or roughly 5% of the initial sample). To determine whether respondents who made open-ended comments had substantially different views from all other respondents, the researchers compared both groups' responses to the closed-ended items and found no substantive differences between the two.

PHASE II: FOCUS GROUPS

Research Design

Sample. Findings from the exploratory (Phase I) survey were used to develop interview protocols for Phase II of the study: a series of four focus groups — two with parents and two with teachers. For this second phase, a random sample of schools was drawn from a tri-district area in and around Louisiana's capitol city — one metropolitan, one suburban, and one rural. Participating LEAs were asked to draw a 10% random sample of parents from the targeted schools, then provide information on the ethnicity, address, and telephone number of each family. Teacher rosters with similar information also were provided for the targeted schools.

Participants were recruited by telephone approximately 10 days in advance of the focus groups. Because homogeneity of grouping is essential in focus group research (Kreuger, 1988), potential participants were screened on key demographic variables before assignment to groups. Parents were assigned to low or middle/high-SES groups to prevent poorly educated participants from feeling intimidated among better-educated peers.

Homogeneity of teacher groupings posed less of a problem,[2] so teachers were assigned to elementary or secondary groups. Teachers also were screened to ensure that each participant had been assigned to his/her school for at least two years, based on the assumption that teachers with several years service at a given site would be familiar with a) the community the school served and b) faculty attitudes toward the *Report Cards*.

Analysis. Field notes from the four focus groups were analyzed using the constant comparative technique (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and QUALPRO text database manager.

Focus Group Findings

As previously mentioned, the focus groups were considered an extension of the Phase I survey in that they enabled the researchers to explore key questions that were raised but not necessarily resolved through the standardized survey. To a large extent, the focus group findings related to three of the five research questions posed in Exhibit I.

1) To what extent are public school parents aware of the *School Report Cards* program?
2) How well do public school parents and faculty understand the information presented on the *1991-92 School Report Cards*?
3) How well do the *1991-92 School Report Cards* convey the type(s) of information that public school parents and faculty want to know about schools?

Findings related to each of these research questions are summarized below.

To what extent are public school parents aware of the program? It became readily apparent in the course of recruiting and later interacting with focus group participants that parent awareness of the *Report Cards* program was extremely low. Very few of the parent prospects contacted during the screening process were familiar with the program or recalled seeing their child's *School Report Card*. Even after receiving a copy in the mail, few parent participants recognized the report. While teacher participants were generally familiar with the program, they were skeptical that parents were very familiar with the *Report Cards* and recounted various problems getting children to carry the reports home. Various suggestions were made for improving the program's visibility, such as mailing *Report Cards* directly to parents, stapling a copy to the child's own report card, running announcements in school newsletters, etc.

How well do public school parents and faculty understand the information? As previously mentioned, the analysis of open-ended comments suggested that some parents and school staff who considered the *Report Cards* easy to read were in fact misinterpreting various indicators. Because it was impossible (based on survey responses) to judge the extent of the problem or to determine why respondents were having difficulty, the issue was explored in depth during the focus groups.

The dialogue with parents and teachers yielded confirmatory evidence that parents and teachers had difficulty understanding the *1991-92 Report Cards*. Pertinent findings are summarized below.

---

[2] It was assumed that teachers would be relatively homogeneous in terms of both income and educational attainment, given their shared profession.

1) Both parent and teacher participants felt that the reading level of the *Report Card text* (which was later estimated at the 13th-grade level using the software program *Grammatik*) was too high, particularly for low-SES and/or poorly educated parents.
2) Parents in particular preferred that more data be presented in text form rather than table format.
3) Parents and teachers alike had difficulty interpreting or at least *relating to* percents (e.g., percent of students dropouts) without accompanying frequencies (i.e., counts of students who dropped out).
4) Both parents and teachers felt the *Report Card* should be more closely tailored to school type so that elementary *Report Cards* would have fewer empty data blocks labeled "data not applicable."

How well do the *School Report Cards* convey the type of information that public school parents and faculty want? As previously mentioned, the analysis of open-ended survey comments showed parent respondents to have a keen interest in test results, teacher participation, and student discipline. However, when the parent groups were asked to identify the "most important" and "least important" indicators, the results were considerably different. Three indicators — test results, class size, and school summary information (i.e., number of faculty and students) — were high on the list of "most important," but the two faculty indicators (faculty degree and certification) and three student behavioral indicators (attendance, suspensions/expulsions, and dropouts) were generally rated low.

In the course of discussion, it became apparent that parents were keenly interested in teacher preparation, but found teacher certification confusing and questioned whether faculty degree was a good indicator of teaching ability. Moreover, several respondents indicated that both areas were outside the influence of parents. Insofar as the student behavior indicators were concerned, parents seemed interested only so far as their own children were concerned. As one mother put it, "I make sure my child is in school — I don't care whether anybody else's is." Black parents expressed interest in the suspension/expulsion indicator, but only if it could be enlarged to break out disciplinary actions by race and gender.

As previously mentioned, faculty respondents to the *Report Card* survey primarily requested additional information on student demographics, particularly SES. Only one teacher volunteered that suggestion in either teacher focus group. When later prompted by the facilitators as to whether student SES should be reported, participants in both groups spoke overwhelmingly against it, fearing that reporting the percent of low-income students in attendance would unnecessarily stigmatize schools.

When asked to identify the "most important" indicators, elementary and secondary teachers identified test scores twice as often as any other indicator. Both groups also cited class size as among the "most important" and student attendance as among the "least important" indicators. On all other indicators, teachers tended to split along elementary/secondary lines. Elementary teachers found teacher certification nearly as important as testing, but rated the remaining student behavioral indicators (suspensions/expulsions and dropouts) and faculty degree as among the "least important." It should be noted, however, that the faculty degree indicator was rated low only by those teachers with less than a master's degree.

CONCLUSION

As previously mentioned, if the primary purpose of school indicator systems is to promote school improvement by providing meaningful data on the condition of education, then the information presented must be both meaningful and understandable to the users — parents and school staff.

Based on feedback from the parental/staff surveys and focus groups, the Bureau of School Accountability made substantial revisions to the format of the *1992-93 School Report Cards (See Appendix)*. These revisions included:

1) replacing the single format used in 1991-92 with individualized formats for elementary, secondary, and K-12 schools;
2) adding explanatory text to each indicator, including descriptive explanations of percents (e.g., "If a school had 90% attendance, then 90 out of every 100 students would be present every day.");
3) enlarging all type and providing additional white space for greater readability,
4) simplifying the presentation of tables;
5) providing both frequencies and percents on most indicators; and
6) rewriting all text to an average 8th-grade level as compared to the former 13th-grade level.

The *1992-93 Report Card* has been praised by policymakers, educators, and parents as a vast improvement over the 1991-92 version. In an attempt to improve the delivery of *Report Cards* to parents, a pilot also is underway that would enable LEAs to mail *Report Cards* to the parents of high school students — the group with the poorest track record for carrying the reports home.

REFERENCES

Children First Act of 1988 §3911.C. *Louisiana Revised Statutes.*

Elam, S.M., Rose, L.C., and Gallup, A.M. (1992, September). The 24th annual Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74* (1), 41-53.

Kreuger, R.A. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

1992-1993

School Report Card

ALL GRADE SCHOOL

1111 Main Street
Baton Rouge, LA 90808
(504)555-5555

SAMPLE

The *School Report Card* gives you important information about your child's school. As you read it, remember that every school is different, with its own special strengths and needs. For that reason, the *Report Card* cannot tell you everything. It can, however, show you several things happening at school that affect your child's education. We urge you to find out more about your school from its teachers and principal; and we encourage you to stay actively involved in your child's education.

SCHOOL SUMMARY

The School

The table to the right gives facts about your school. When the school year ended your school had 430 students in grades K-12.

Your School

Grades	Students
K-12	430

The Faculty

There were 30 faculty members at your school in 1992-93. The faculty includes teachers, principals, librarians, and counselors. It is important that children are taught by teachers who are prepared. One way teachers prepare themselves is through more education. In the table, the larger the percent for your school, the more faculty members have gone back to college. Statewide, 44% (44 out of every 100 faculty) had a master's degree or higher.

Faculty with a Master's Degree or Higher

Your School	District	State
46%	50%	44%

State School Code: 010002

SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

The number of students in a class and the discipline at a school affect your child's education. Information on attendance, suspensions, expulsions and dropouts tells us how much time students spend in school. This information also tells us how difficult it is for some children to finish school.

How Large are the Classes?

Small classes allow teachers more time with each student. Teachers find small classes less stressful. Students who attend schools with smaller classes generally score higher on state tests. In 1992-93, 10 classes at your school (25%) had 1-20 students, 20 classes (50%) had 21-26 students, and 10 classes (25%) had 27 or more. Classes such as band, choir, and P.E. are excluded.

Class Size

Students Per Class	Your School	District	State
1-20	25%	15%	17%
21-26	50%	60%	63%
27 +	25%	25%	20%

Is Attending School Important to My Child's Education?

Students who attend school every day are more likely to do better in school and are less likely to drop out. Schools with better attendance usually have higher test scores. If a school had 90% attendance, then 90 out of every 100 students would be present every day.

Student Attendance

Your School	District
90%	95%

How Many Students are Suspended or Expelled?

The number of students suspended or expelled is one way of looking at discipline. In 1992-93, 15 students (14.2%) were suspended at your school. These were out-of-school suspensions. During the same year, 3 students (2.0%) were expelled.

Students Suspended & Expelled

	Your School Number	Your School Percent	District Percent
Suspended	15	14.2%	9.5%
Expelled	3	2.0%	15.0%

How Many Students Dropped Out?

It is important for students to finish high school. Students who do not complete school have a harder time getting good jobs. If a school had 4% student dropouts, then 4 out of every 100 students would have dropped out.

Student Dropouts

Grade Level	Your School Number	Your School Percent	District Percent
7	3	7.1%	1.7%
8	11	0.0%	2.2%
9	10	20.0%	4.1%
10	9	30.4%	4.1%
11	2	5.6%	2.3%
12	0	0.0%	6.3%
7-12	35	10.7%	3.3%

State School Code: 010002

COLLEGE READINESS

Are Students Ready for College?

One way to tell if students are prepared for college is to look at their ACT scores. The ACT table shows the average score for your school, district, state, and nation. The best possible ACT score is 36.

ACT Scores

Your School	District	State	Nation
18.3	19.5	19.4	20.6

Another way to tell if students are prepared is to see how many took remedial courses in college. Of the 200 students who graduated from your school in 1991-92, 175 (88%) attended a Louisiana public college in the fall of 1992. Of those 175 students, 80 (46%) took at least one remedial course. Statewide, 50% (50 out of every 100 first-time freshmen) took a remedial course.

Graduates Who Took a Remedial Course in College

Your School		District	State
Number	Percent	Percent	Percent
80	46%	52%	50%

TESTING

To measure student learning, the state gives two types of tests. For grades 4 and 6, the CAT compares Louisiana students to students nationwide. The LEAP tests that are given in grades 3, 5, 7, and the Graduation Exit Exam measure what the state expects students to learn.

How Do Our Students Compare Nationally?

Your school's median percentile rank in 1992-93 was 70 for grade 4 and 80 for grade 6. The table compares your school to the district, state, and nation.

CAT - Grades 4 and 6 Median Percentile Rank

Grade Level	Your School	District	State	Nation
Grade 4	70	67	72	50
Grade 6	80	87	65	50

HOW TO READ THE LEAP RESULTS

The black bar in each graph shows the percent of students at your school who passed the test in 1992-93. The white bar is for the district and the shaded bar is for the state.



How Many Third Graders at Your School Passed the LEAP Tests?

Language Arts. In 1992-93, 100% (100 out of every 100 students) passed.

Math. In 1992-93, 77% (77 out of every 100 students) passed.



How Many Fifth Graders at Your School Passed the LEAP Tests?

Language Arts. In 1992-93, 100% (100 out of every 100 students) passed.

Math. In 1992-93, 77% (77 out of every 100 students) passed.



How Many Seventh Graders at Your School Passed the LEAP Tests?

Language Arts. In 1992-93, 100% (100 out of every 100 students) passed.

Math. In 1992-93, 77% (77 out of every 100 students) passed.



How Many Students at Your School Passed the Graduation Exit Exam?

English Language Arts. In 1992-93, 100% (100 out of every 100 students) passed.

Math. In 1992-93, 77% (77 out of every 100 students) passed.

Written Composition. In 1992-93, 70% (70 out of every 100 students) passed.



Science. In 1992-93, 100% (100 out of every 100 students) passed.

Social Studies. In 1992-93, 77% (77 out of every 100 students) passed.

Enterprise High School

P.O. Box 100
Enterprise, Louisiana 71425-0000
Catahoula Parish

This School Report Card contains important facts about this school, its district, and in some instances, the state and the nation.

Note:

- Tables and charts in this report include data on all students who attend regular education classes. Data for special education students who do *not* attend regular education classes are omitted.
- The data presented in Table 4 include all regular and special education faculty.
- "N/A" applies to data which are "Not Applicable."

1. School Summary Information

Information Category	1990-91	1991-92
School Name	Enterprise High School	Enterprise High School
Grade Levels	K-12,S	P,K-12
End-of-Year Membership	108	116
- Regular Education	108	116
- Special Education	0	0
Number of Faculty	14	13

2. Percent of Faculty with a Master's Degree or Higher

School	District	State
1991-92	1991-92	1991-92
46.15	35.60	44.12

Louisiana Progress Profile
School Report Card
School Year 1991 - 1992

3. Percent of Classes By Grades and Class Size Range

Grades	Class Size Range	School		District	State
		1990-91	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92
K - 3	1 - 12	38.46	50.00	14.49	4.24
	13 - 20	61.54	50.00	37.68	31.92
	21 - 26	0.00	0.00	47.83	62.68
	27 or more	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.16
4 - 12	1 - 12	55.26	69.70	28.88	8.65
	13 - 20	42.11	30.30	32.22	19.71
	21 - 26	2.63	0.00	30.45	37.01
	27 - 33	0.00	0.00	8.45	34.60
	34 or more	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04

The State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has set class size limits. Grades K-3 should have no more than 26 students in a class. Classes in grades 4-12 should have no more than 33 students. Activity classes such as band, PE, and chorus are not included. These classes are allowed to have more than 33 students.

4. Percent of Classes Taught by Faculty Who Hold State-Issued Certificates for These Classes

School		District	State
1990-91	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92
77.89	71.06	81.98	87.18

The majority of the remaining classes are taught by faculty who are authorized by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education but do not hold state-issued certificates for those particular classes.

State School Code: 013003

5. Percent of Student Attendance

School		District
1990-91	1991-92	1991-92
94.73	96.61	93.70

Student attendance data should be viewed with caution since no standard definition for a day of attendance existed for either the 1990-91 or the 1991-92 school years. However, a standard definition piloted during the 1992-93 school year will be implemented beginning with the 1993-94 school year.

6. Percent of Student Dropouts

Grade Level	School		District	State
	1990-91	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.72
8	9.09	0.00	0.93	2.15
9	0.00	0.00	3.85	5.57
10	0.00	0.00	2.30	4.87
11	0.00	0.00	0.77	4.43
12	0.00	0.00	1.49	3.43
Total 7 - 12	1.39	0.00	1.55	3.66

For the 1991-92 school year, a total of 0 students dropped out of this school.

7. Percent of Students Suspended and Expelled

Disciplinary Action	School		District
	1990-91	1991-92	1991-92
Suspended	2.92	5.08	12.42
Expelled	0.00	0.00	0.43

This table shows only out-of-school suspensions.

For the 1991-92 school year, 6 students were suspended and 0 students were expelled from this school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Enterprise High School

8a. Grade 3 CRT - Percent Passing



Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, the percent of students at this school passing
- Language Arts decreased from 100% to 80%, and
- Mathematics did not change.

8b. Grade 5 CRT - Percent Passing



Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, the percent of students at this school passing
- Language Arts increased from 93% to 100%, and
- Mathematics decreased from 100% to 80%.

8c. Grade 7 CRT - Percent Passing



Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, the percent of students at this school passing
- Language Arts decreased from 100% to 91%,
- Mathematics increased from 75% to 91%, and
- Written Composition did not change.

Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP)

Louisiana administers two types of tests to our students.

1. A criterion-referenced test (CRT) provides information on how well students are meeting state standards. The CRT at the secondary level is referred to as the Graduation Exit Examination (GEE).
2. A norm-referenced test (NRT) provides information on how Louisiana students compare with other students nationally.

The state test results reflect scores for regular education students and special education students identified as gifted and/or talented, speech impaired, and/or hospital/homebound.

8d. Graduation Exit Exam (GEE)-Percent Passing



Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, the percent of students at this school passing
- English Language Arts did not change,
- Mathematics did not change, and
- Written Composition decreased from 100% to 90%.

8e. Graduation Exit Exam (GEE)-Percent Passing



Between 1990-91 and 1991-92, the percent of students at this school passing
- Science did not change, and
- Social Studies did not change.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. NRT Results

Percent of Students Scoring above the National 50th Percentile

Grade Level	School		District	State	National Norm Group
	1990-91	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92
Grade 4	50.0	50.0	46.3	44.0	50.0
Grade 6	50.0	50.0	48.3	49.6	50.0
Grade 9	66.7	66.6	65.4	44.5	50.0

The above chart indicates how well the students in this school, the district, and the state did as compared to other students across the nation (national norm group).

10. ACT Results

Average Composite Scores

School		District (public)	State (public & non-public)	Nation (public & non-public)
1990-91	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92	1991-92
23.0	19.0	18.5	19.4	20.6

The American College Test (ACT) is a national test used for college entrance. The ACT composite score is based on the scores for the four ACT assessment tests: English, Mathematics, Reading, and Science Reasoning. The highest possible composite score is 36.

Individualized School-level Progress Profiles (School Report Cards) were prepared for 1,388 of the 1,444 public schools in Louisiana. Some special education, alternative, and vocational education centers did not receive Progress Profiles due to a lack of data in some areas. The district and state averages/percentages presented in this report are based on those schools receiving Progress Profiles.